

Pursuant to Ind. Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT:

MICHAEL S. GREENE
Elkhart, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

STEVE CARTER
Attorney General of Indiana

MARA McCABE
Deputy Attorney General
Indianapolis, Indiana

**IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA**

EDDIE G. LOVE,)	
)	
Appellant-Defendant,)	
)	
vs.)	No. 20A03-0703-CR-160
)	
STATE OF INDIANA,)	
)	
Appellee-Plaintiff.)	

APPEAL FROM THE ELKHART CIRCUIT COURT
The Honorable Terry Shewmaker, Judge
Cause No. 20C01-0602-FB-12

October 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

CRONE, Judge

Eddie G. Love appeals his two convictions for class B felony dealing in cocaine. We affirm.

The relevant facts most favorable to the jury's verdict indicate that on February 6 and 7, 2006, a confidential informant supervised by Elkhart police conducted controlled buys of crack cocaine inside a home on Second Street. Each time, Love sold the informant \$20 worth of cocaine. The informant had known Love for six or seven months and had had contact with him "more than three, but less than 10" times prior to the controlled buys. Tr. at 61. The State charged Love with two counts of class B felony dealing in cocaine. On June 15, 2006, a jury found Love guilty as charged.

Love challenges the sufficiency of the evidence supporting his convictions. Our standard of review is well settled:

When reviewing the sufficiency of the evidence to support a conviction, appellate courts must consider only the probative evidence and reasonable inferences *supporting* the verdict. It is the fact-finder's role, not that of appellate courts, to assess witness credibility and weigh the evidence to determine whether it is sufficient to support a conviction.... Appellate courts affirm the conviction unless no reasonable fact-finder could find the elements of the crime proven beyond a reasonable doubt. It is therefore not necessary that the evidence overcome every reasonable hypothesis of innocence. The evidence is sufficient if an inference may reasonably be drawn from it to support the verdict.

Drane v. State, 867 N.E.2d 144, 146-47 (Ind. 2007) (citations, quotation marks, footnote, and alterations omitted) (emphasis in *Drane*). "[T]he uncorroborated testimony of a single witness is sufficient to sustain a conviction on appeal." *Seketa v. State*, 817 N.E.2d 690, 696 (Ind. Ct. App. 2004).

Love's argument is merely an invitation to assess the informant's credibility and reweigh the evidence in his favor. This we may not do. Therefore, we affirm.

Affirmed.

DARDEN, J., and MAY, J., concur.